



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

opinion of the masses subsequently suppressed those barbarous institutions. The relations between the citizens of the same country have been put upon a secure basis of law and order, and no one would wish to return to the régime of arbitrary government.

There is the same need of security among the nations, and every year that passes amidst the sufferings of a threatening situation renders the need more imperative.

Education, the good sense of the masses and the identity of interests of the populations in all civilized states are establishing a current of public opinion which will be irresistible when the nations themselves desire that it should be so.

Let no one say that there are some international disputes which can be settled only by an appeal to violence. War would not settle any of the grave problems of our age; it would only render them more difficult in the near future.

It is for you, citizens of all nations, to demand that the pacific declarations which the governments feel the necessity of constantly reiterating should result in the creation of permanent institutions.

The Universal Peace Congress met for the first time on German soil, in the free city of Hamburg, includes representatives from seventeen nations of Europe and America. It appeals to public opinion and earnestly asks for its support. The dangers of the present situation of Europe are well known to everybody.

Members of the great human family, whatever your social position, you all have the same need of justice, of concord and of peace. Unite your efforts; no human power will be able to resist them; and by proclaiming the reign of justice in the relations between nation and nation you will at the same time have proclaimed for your families security from the disasters of war in the future."

## ADDRESSES DELIVERED AT THE MOHONK ARBITRATION CONFERENCE.

### ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT DREHER.

Deeply interested though I am in the cause of arbitration, I have not been able before this to attend a Mohonk Conference on that great question, owing to the fact that the Conferences are held so near the Commencement season of our Southern colleges. Having enjoyed three of the Indian Conferences, I have found it increasingly difficult to decline an invitation to Mohonk. Hence I have "strained a point" to be here at the present Conference.

I regret that I cannot point with pride to the position of the senators from Virginia and other Southern states on this question, as my friend, the Secretary of the Conference, has done with reference to the senators from New England. But I am happy to say that the colleges and universities of the South, like those at the North, are on the right side of the arbitration question.

As I understand it, we have met this evening, not to discuss the merits of arbitration in general, or of the recently proposed Anglo-American treaty in particular, or to express our regrets at the rejection of that treaty by the Senate; but the topic before us is the causes which led to the failure of the Senate to ratify that treaty. In the first place, it may be said that the treaty came before the Senate at an inauspicious time. The attitude first

assumed by England with reference to the boundary question in Venezuela, and then the inaction of Great Britain during the Armenian massacres, and the long-delayed intervention in the war between Greece and Turkey, had produced an unfavorable feeling—not to say real distrust—on the part of our people towards the English government. It was particularly unfortunate, also, that the treaty came before the Senate so soon after a heated political campaign, fought mainly on the issue of free coinage of silver. The advocates of "free silver" view with disfavor any closer relations with England, since they believe that our financial legislation is controlled in the interests of that country, which is on the gold basis. It is certainly not a mere coincidence that the silver-producing states were arrayed solidly against the ratification of the proposed treaty, and that so large a majority of the other senators in favor of the free coinage of silver also voted against ratification. In this connection it should also be borne in mind that the stand taken by President Cleveland and his Cabinet in the late presidential campaign intensified the feeling of antagonism on the part of the advocates of free silver against any measure proposed as the crowning act of an administration which they cordially disliked. Whatever weight may be given to the various arguments against the treaty, I think it may be safely affirmed that had it come before the Senate a year earlier, unembarrassed by these peculiar political or party questions, it would almost certainly have been ratified by an overwhelming majority.

A good deal has been said recently about the hatred felt by Americans towards England. We are told by men like Mr. Depew that such a feeling is pretty general in the United States, and others inform us that this sentiment of ill-will is fostered by the manner in which the Revolutionary War is treated in the histories used in our schools. This reminds me of the criticisms we hear of the histories of our Civil War, some people at the North complaining that these books are too favorable to the South, while many Southern people declare that these same books do the South so great injustice that it is important to have other histories prepared for use in Southern schools. For myself, I cannot believe that there is to any considerable extent a feeling of ill-will among our people towards the English, whom we seldom think of as foreigners, but as our brethen of the great Anglo-Saxon race. Nor do I believe that our school histories incite any feeling of hatred towards England.

It has been said in this Conference that the "old war feeling" in the South was opposed to the treaty. I happen to be a Southerner myself,—a native of South Carolina and an adopted son of Virginia, and I may add also that I am an ex-Confederate soldier, though far from being a veteran in that service. I venture to say that, notwithstanding a little "jingoism" now and then, there is no desire on the part of the Southern people for war; but if war should come in spite of all efforts to the contrary, there would be no lack of loyalty at the South to the old flag. It seems to me that the military spirit is fostered to an unnecessary extent in our country; and although it may be urged that military discipline develops manly character, I cannot repress a sense of sincere regret that so many of the boys of our country are in military schools or under military training. That our government must for years to come maintain a military and a naval academy may be admitted; but it does not seem

necessary to place the thousands of young men in our agricultural and mechanical institutions under military regulations and discipline. Still less necessary is it to detail and support army officers, to teach military tactics in private colleges and schools, as is now done to a considerable extent, the government having on its hands a large number of superfluous officers for this purpose. In the South two states, Virginia and South Carolina, support military schools at public expense, and that, too, in the face of the fact that the general government is educating more men at West Point than are needed for all military purposes in our country. In the South there are, I think, more military schools than at the North. As carrying concealed weapons by our boys makes incipient murderers, so military drill under arms, with all the trappings of war, arouses the soldier spirit in young men; and when we add to this the hero worship of our successful generals, the glamour of military glory on the pages of history, the long-deferred promotion of so many army officers, and the long-delayed opportunity to win such promotion, we should not be surprised that the war spirit may be so easily aroused, if not created, on occasion in our country, and that it should oppose the ratification of an arbitration treaty.

One of the saddest features of the highest civilization of Europe to-day is the burden of taxation imposed to maintain great armies and navies, so-called Christian nations strengthening their armaments from year to year to preserve the peace of Europe! How oppressively sad the thought that in the closing years of the nineteenth century, since the coming of Him, who was called the "Prince of Peace," men should be taxing their ingenuity to invent more and more deadly weapons for the slaughter of their fellowmen! It seems to me that the chief glory of our country is to be found in the fact that it is so strong in spite of its small army and navy,—strong in the loyal and patriotic devotion of seventy millions of people. I wish that our schools, colleges and universities would inculcate the duty of international arbitration, and that the Christian Church would not only pray "Thy kingdom come," but work unceasingly to realize the full meaning of that beautiful song, "on earth peace, goodwill toward men," which announced the advent of its divine Founder. To that great consummation, so devoutly to be wished, the incoming of the kingdom of peace and righteousness among the nations of the earth, may we not hope and pray that the Mohonk Conferences may contribute their full share!

#### ADDRESS OF PROF. JEAN C. BRACQ.

*Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen,* — At the beginning of the eighteenth century, the Abbé de St. Pierre unfolded before the French people a scheme of universal peace and a tribunal of arbitration; but no one took him seriously. A man who held one of the highest positions in France spoke of it as only "the dream of a good man." Yet to-day the principle is admitted in France by a very large number of people. It is not considered Utopian, but is thought of as a mode of action which, sooner or later, will be recognized and practised by the nations.

I wish to lay stress this morning upon the attitude of the French people toward the peace question. People frequently speak to me of the immense armaments of France. These great armaments arise simply from a desire for security. The French people have voted

funds and have made great sacrifices, not for any aggressive purpose, but with the idea of being able to defend their homes against any invader. If you go into French society to-day, you can find very few intelligent men who speak favorably of war. I defy any one to mention, among the remainders of our cabinets (and France has quite a collection of that kind) a minister of state, with one exception, who has been in favor of war; and the one who did advocate war was obliged to cease doing so for fear of losing his popularity. The same may be said of the senators. I think a great deal of the French Senate and of the American Senate also, notwithstanding certain pages of its history. If you eliminate from your political history your Senate, you take away some of the most glorious names in American politics. If you look at our House of Deputies, you cannot find a man who advocates war. If you read the proclamations of our politicians, you will find not a single one who comes before the people without speaking of peace. You can always gauge the wants of a nation by the offers the politicians make them!

The immense armament of France is a part of a great movement. By the side of it there has been a great educational movement. Our expenses for war have been increased one-half since 1870; our expenses for education have increased sixfold. They were twenty-four million francs at the beginning of the Republic; they are now one hundred and fifty million. We have made great sacrifices for secondary education, for the education of women. The scientific development of France has been phenomenal during the last twenty-five years, and the same thing may be said of the artistic life. As I look at this great educational movement, the armament of France is subordinate to this larger expansion of life, to this unfolding of energy in which the arts of peace have prominence.

I have great hopes for the triumph in France of the principles that you represent. But I want to say to this Conference that you have to exercise some tact in presenting them to the French people. And this leads me to feel not very much dismayed at the rejection of this treaty. While there are intelligent Frenchmen who recognize the greatness and beneficence of English civilization, who know the great philosophical and scientific and literary and religious contribution of England to the civilization of the world, there are others who know what another phase of English civilization means. We remember Nova Scotia, the land of Evangeline; we remember opium in China; we remember the Matabeles who have been mowed down by the Maxim guns of Englishmen; we remember how Madagascar is drowned with English rum; we remember what Englishmen have done in Australia and in other parts of the world, where lower races have been crushed. So if this principle of arbitration is presented to us directly from the United States, it will meet fewer prejudices, and will commend itself to the best intelligence of France, as it would fail to do if presented by Englishmen and Americans together.

The soul of the Abbé de St. Pierre would have been filled with gladness if he had thought of the possibility of such an audience of men as this, representing those principles so dear to his heart. These meetings are very good; agitation is very good. But my idea is that something is to be done along educational lines. The first thing that needs to be done is to shed great light upon